



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,511	03/30/2004	Hanna Yehuda	EMC04-07(04031)	3209
58404	7590	09/19/2007		
BARRY W. CHAPIN CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			EXAMINER WONG, WILLIAM	
			ART UNIT 2178	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/812,511

Applicant(s)

YEHUDA ET AL.

Examiner

William Wong

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to the communication filed on July 2, 2007.

- Claims 1, 9, 13, 14, 15, 18, 25, 34, 38, 39, and 40 have been amended.

Claims 1-49 are pending and have been examined. Previous double patenting rejection has been withdrawn in view of terminal disclaimer. Previous claim objections and 35 U.S.C. 112 rejections have been withdrawn in view of amendments. Previous 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections have been withdrawn in view of current office policy.

Specification

1. The use of trademarks HITACHI, IBM, and HEWLETT PACKARD has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2178

3. Claim 1-6, 8-11, 15-16, 18-24, 26-31, 33-36, 40-41, and 43-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1).

As per independent claim 1, Axberg teaches a **method for managing access rights of host resources with respect to corresponding storage systems** (in paragraph 1), **the method comprising: receiving a selection of at least one host resource associated with a storage area network** (in paragraph 353); **in addition to receiving the selection of the at least one host resource, receiving a selection of at least one storage parameter associated with the storage area network** (in paragraph 357-358); **and correlating the selection of the at least one host resource with the selection of the at least one storage parameter to identify: i) storage devices of the at least one storage system resource corresponding to the at least one storage parameter** (in paragraph 357-358 and figure 21), **and ii) access control rights of the at least one host resource with respect to the storage devices** (in paragraph 353 and figure 21), but does not specifically teach the selection of at least one storage parameter including **selection of a vendor type associated with a storage system resource**. However, Axberg teaches filtering based on one or more criteria (in paragraph 357 and in figure 21-22), which includes filtering based on vendor type (in paragraph 353 and in figure 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg in order to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **via a common and consistent graphical user interface, providing a user an ability to display the access control rights of the at least one host resource with respect to different vendor types of storage system resources** (in paragraph 353).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **via the common and consistent graphical user interface, enabling a user to modify access rights associated with the at least one host resource for a selected storage system resource of a selected vendor type** (in paragraphs 354-355).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating vendor specific commands, depending on the selected storage system resource of the selected vendor type** (in paragraph 135 and in paragraph 674-675) **to modify access rights associated with the storage devices in the selected storage system resource** (in paragraphs 354-355).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches configuring and/or manage storage devices, which includes modifying access rights (in paragraphs 354-355), using vendor specific commands (in paragraph 674-675), which reads on **for a first selected storage system resource of a first vendor type, generating a first set of vendor specific commands to modify access rights associated with the first selected storage system resource; and for a second selected storage system resource of a second vendor type, generating a second**

Art Unit: 2178

set of vendor specific commands to modify access rights associated with the second selected storage system resource.

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating an output to a display screen** (in paragraph 352 and figure 1); **in a first region on the display screen, displaying multiple icons representing corresponding host resources in the storage area network** (in paragraph 353); and **in relation to at least one of the multiple icons, maintaining corresponding visual regions to receive input commands from a user making the selection of the at least one host resource** (in paragraph 353).

As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **providing a view of storage devices associated with the selection of the at least one storage parameter** (in paragraph 357), **the view including a visual indication whether any of the at least one host resource has access rights to a corresponding storage device** (in paragraph 353).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **providing an indication of which host resources have access rights to corresponding storage devices** (in paragraph 353 and figure 18).

As per claim 10, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **in response to receiving a selected parameter, displaying storage system resources associated with the selected parameter** (in paragraphs 357-358); and **providing a unique identifier associated with each of the displayed storage**

system resources (in paragraphs 353 and figures 18-21). As explained in claim 1, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg in order to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor. This selection results in the **displaying of storage system resources associated with the selected vendor type**, which inherently requires **receiving a signal identifying a selected vendor type** prior to the displaying in order to acknowledge the selection.

As per claim 11, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **enabling a user to select a storage system resource of the selected parameter** (in paragraphs 354-355 and figures 19-20) and **based on a user selected storage system resource, providing a display of storage devices associated with the at least one host resource and the user selected storage system resource** (in paragraphs 354-355 and figures 19-20).

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **displaying multiple storage device icons in a first region of a display screen, each storage device icon representing a corresponding storage device accessible by the at least one host resource** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17); and **displaying a related tree selection in a second region of the display screen, the related tree selection indicating which, if any, of the at least one host resource has access rights to the at least one storage device represented by the storage device icons displayed in the first region** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17).

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **receiving a signal indicating a selected at least one storage device** (in paragraphs 354-355); and **providing a display for a network manager to modify access rights associated with a selected at least one host resource for accessing the selected at least one storage device** (in paragraphs 354-355).

As per claim 18, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **displaying a list of storage devices associated with a selection of a particular storage system of a selected vendor type** (in paragraphs 357-358), **a table view including a listing of selectable storage device icons as well as corresponding access control information** (in paragraphs 353-354), **an icon view including a presentation of selectable storage device icons with visual indication of access rights** (in paragraphs 349 and 353) and **enabling a user to toggle a display view of the storage devices between the table view and the icon view** (in paragraph 347, therefore the user inherently is able to toggle between views).

As per claim 19, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, which teaches **the method as in claim 1, wherein receiving the selection of the at least one storage parameter includes receiving a selection of a vendor type of storage system resource** (see rejection of claim 1).

As per claim 20, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating an output for a display screen to display an access relationship to a user** (in figure 21), **the display screen including: i) a first region**

for the user to make the selection of the at least one host resource (in figure 21), ii) a second region for the user to make a selection of the at least one storage parameter (in figure 21), and iii) a third region for viewing the storage devices associated with the at least one storage parameter (in figure 21).

As per claim 21, the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated, which includes **wherein receiving the selection of the at least one storage parameter includes receiving a selection of a vendor type of storage system resource (see rejection of claim 1).**

As per claim 22, the rejection of claim 20 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **generating the output for the display screen includes: locating the first region on a left side of the display screen (in figure 21); locating the second region on an upper right portion of the display screen (in figure 21); and locating the third region on a bottom tight portion of the display screen (in figure 21).**

As per independent claim 23, Axberg teaches **a method for displaying access rights of host resources with respect to corresponding storage system resources in a storage area network (in paragraph 1 and 353), the method comprising: receiving an identity of at least one selected host resource associated with the storage area network (in paragraph 25 and 30); retrieving a first managed object from a management database that corresponds to the at least one selected host resource (in paragraph 30); identifying at least one storage system resource associated with the at least one selected host resource based on i) information in the first managed object (in paragraph 30), and ii) information in other corresponding managed objects in the management database (in paragraph 30);**

and providing a user an ability to display access control rights of the at least one selected host resource with respect to different vendor types of storage system resources (in paragraph 353).

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **extracting information from the first managed object corresponding to the at least one selected host resource (in paragraphs 24-25 and 30); extracting information from other managed objects associated with managed entities in the storage area network (in paragraph 30); storing the information extracted from the first managed object and the other managed objects in corresponding data structures (in paragraph 30); based on processing of information in the data structures, identifying an access relationship between the at least one selected host resource and storage devices associated with the storage system resources (in paragraph 30); and generating an output for a display screen to display the access relationship to a user (in paragraph 353), the display screen including: i) a first region for the user to make the selection of the at least one host resource (in figures 21), ii) a second region for the user to make a selection of at least one storage parameter (in figures 21), and iii) a third region for viewing the storage devices associated with the at least one host resource based on a user selected at least one storage parameter (in figures 21).**

Claims 26-31, 33, 35-36, 40-41, and 43-47 are the computer system claims corresponding to the method claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 15-16, and 18-22 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims

Art Unit: 2178

1-6, 8, 10-11, 15-16, and 18-22. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); and **an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

As per claim 34, the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated and as best understood by the examiner, Axberg further teaches **providing an indication which host resources have access rights to corresponding storage devices** (in paragraph 353 and figure 18).

Claim 48 is the computer program product claim corresponding to the computer system claim 26, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 26. Axberg further teaches **a computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon for processing data information** (in paragraph 463 and 630), **such that the instructions, when carried out by a processing device** (in paragraph 133), **enable the processing device to perform the steps of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

Claim 49 is a computer system claim corresponding to the computer system claim 26, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the

Art Unit: 2178

rejection of claim 26. Axberg further teaches the means to perform the operations of claim 26 (in paragraph 133).

4. Claims 7 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Kekic et al. (US 5,999,179).

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **displaying a hierarchy of multiple icons to facilitate the selection of the at least one host resource associated with the storage area network** (in paragraph 84 and figures 18-22 and 34), but does not specifically teach **enabling a user to expand a view of the hierarchy of multiple icons**. However, Kekic teaches enabling a user to expand and collapse a view of a hierarchy of multiple icons to facilitate selection of host resources (in column 23 lines 63-67, column 24 lines 1-2, and figure 6c). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Kekic in order to provide the user with the ability to focus in on and display group information relevant to the resource of interest.

Claim 32 is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim 7, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 7. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89);

and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

5. Claims 12 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Person ("Using the AutoFilter", Special Edition Using Microsoft Excel 97, Que, December 17, 1996, pgs. 1-7).

As per claim 12, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, but Axberg does not specifically teach **providing a pull-down menu of functional options associated with the selected vendor type, the pull-down menu of functional options including at least one of: i) display physically connected storage system resources associated with the at least one host resource for the selected vendor type; ii) display all storage devices associated with the selected vendor type; and iii) display physically unconnected storage devices associated with the at least one host resource for the selected vendor type**. However, Person teaches providing a pull-down menu of functional options associate with a selected parameter, the pull-down menu of functional options including displaying all associated with a selected parameter (in figure 38.10 and page 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg to include the pull-down menu of Person in order to allow the user to quickly filter the storage devices displayed.

Claim 37 is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim 12, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 12. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

6. Claims 13-14, 25 and 38-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Axberg et al. (US 6009466 A, hereinafter "Axberg2").

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **displaying unique identifiers of storage system resources** (in figures 18-21); and **receiving a signal identifying a user selected storage system resource** (in paragraph 353), but does not specifically teach **for the user selected storage system resource, displaying access ports associated with accessing the storage devices**. However, Axberg2 teaches displaying access ports associated with accessing storage devices for the user selected storage system (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Axberg2 in order to provide the user with the ability to determine the ports through which the host resources can access the storage devices.

As per claim 14, the combination of Axberg and Axberg2 teaches the method of claim 13. Additionally, Axberg2 teaches **enabling a user to modify a selection of at least one of the displayed access ports** (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E); **and receiving a modified selection of the displayed access ports** (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E) and Axberg teaches **displaying a list of storage devices based on modifications** (in paragraph 353-355).

As per claim 25, the rejection of claim 24 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **receiving a user generated selection of the at least one storage parameter in the second region, the user generated selection including: i) receiving a selection of a parameter of storage system resource** (in paragraphs 357-358); **and ii) receiving a selection of a uniquely identified storage system resource of a selected parameter in step i** (in paragraphs 354-355 and figure 18-21), but does not specifically teach the selection of parameter of storage system resource including a **vendor type**. However, Axberg teaches filtering based on one or more criteria (in paragraph 357 and in figure 21-22), which includes filtering based on vendor type (in paragraph 353 and in figure 21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg in order to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor. As best understood by the examiner, Axberg also does not specifically teach

receiving a user generated selection of storage ports through which host resources access the storage devices of the storage system resources described above. However, Axberg2 teaches receiving a user generated selection of storage ports through which host resources access storage devices (in column 13 lines 7-16 and figure 12E). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Axberg2 in order to provide the user with the ability to determine the ports through which the host resources can access the storage devices.

Claims 38 and 39 are the computer system claims corresponding to the method claims 13 and 14 respectively, and are rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 13 and 14. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface is inherent in order for the computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

7. Claim 17 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. (US 2003/0149769 A1) in view of Levine et al. (US 5,060,135).

Art Unit: 2178

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and Axberg further teaches **identifying a number of host resources able to access a corresponding storage device** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17) by selecting **storage device icons associated with the storage devices** (in paragraph 349 and figure 17), but Axberg does not specifically teach **selectively providing symbols near storage device icons associated with the storage devices** to perform the identifying. However, Levine teaches the insertion or removal of symbols near an icon to identify a number of associating elements of that which the icon represents (in column 17 lines 1-9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Axberg with the teaching of Levine in order to quickly convey to the user the number of hosts corresponding to the storage device without user selection.

Claim 42 is the computer system claim corresponding to the method claim 17, and is rejected under the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 17. Axberg further teaches **a processor** (in paragraph 133); **a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor** (in paragraph 463 and 630); **a communication interface that supports communication with other nodes of the storage area network** (in paragraph 17 and paragraph 89); **and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface** is inherent in order for the **computer system to be enabled to execute the application and perform operations of the corresponding method claims** (see corresponding method claims).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed July 2, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues, in substance, that examiner offers no reasoning in support of obviousness in regards to the independent claims and that the cited paragraphs do not disclose identifying access control rights. However, examiner respectfully disagrees.

Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Furthermore, in regards to *KSR v. Teleflex*, the case forecloses the argument that a *specific* teaching, suggestion, or motivation is required to support a finding of obviousness. See the recent Board decision *Ex Parte Smith*, --USPQ2d--, slip op. at 20, (Bd. Pat. App. & Interf. June 25, 2007) (citing *KSR*, 82 USPQ2d at 1396) (available at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/bpai/prec/fd071925.pdf>).

In this case, sufficient reasoning and motivation from the Axberg reference was provided. As stated above in the claim rejection, Axberg teaches filtering based on one or more criteria (in paragraph 357 and in figure 21-22 showing that a user can filter based on selected capacity, vendor, product, etc. to identify the storage devices

corresponding to the one or more criteria), which includes filtering based on vendor type (in paragraph 353 and in figure 21). Since Axberg provides for the selection of vendor type using this filtering mechanism to identify the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a vendor type in the teaching of Axberg for the purpose of identifying the storage devices corresponding to a particular vendor.

In regards to the alleged claim that Axberg does not disclose identifying access control rights, Axberg discloses, for example, in paragraph 353 a status parameter to indicate whether or not the accessible LUNs are assigned or not assigned to a host and also shown under the "Status" parameter in figure 21. Hence, Axberg demonstrates a form of access control rights (e.g. accessible, assigned, unassigned pending, not assigned) since it indicates what degree of access is available, or what control the host has over a LUN, or if there are any other further limits on access.

Therefore, the obviousness rejection is proper and the rejection stands.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2178

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Wong whose telephone number is 571-270-1399. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 EST with every other Friday 7:30-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/William Wong/


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER